

# REMARKS

This Response is in response to the final Office Action mailed December 12, 2002. Claims 6, 7 and 11 to 13 are pending in this application. Claim 6, 7 and 11 to 13 are being amended herein. Applicants believe that no fee is due in connection with this Response After Final, however, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-1818 for any payment necessary.

In the Office Action, Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 due to a lack of antecedent basis for "the router." Claims 6, 7 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,944,203 to Brekelbaum ("*Brekelbaum*"). Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of *Brekelbaum*.

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, the amendment to claim 13 has rendered the rejection moot.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 6 under *Brekelbaum*, Claim 6 as amended is directed to a router table having a vertical support and a table top. At least three sets of mounting hole patterns for routers having different mounting footprints are provided. *Brekelbaum* does not teach or suggest such a table.

As has been established in prior papers, *Brekelbaum* describes a table having a different purpose than the routing table of Claim 6. That different purpose is embodied in structural features that do not teach Claim 6 as amended. In particular, table top 32 of *Brekelbaum* defines only a single hole pattern, used to allow stanchions 36, having fixedly spaced apart pegs 60, to be located in different positions on table top 32. *Brekelbaum* appears to desire, for simplicity, to operate with stanchions 36 having a single peg spacing. There is thus no motivation provided by *Brekelbaum*, and indeed *Brekelbaum* appears to teach away from, providing hole patterns with different hole center spacings.

The invention of Claim 6, on the other hand, is directed to a table that is flexible to operate with different types and brands of routers. Different routers have differently sized hole pattern footprints as illustrated by Tables 1 to 3 of the present specification. The router table of Claim 6 is configured structurally to mount to a plurality of those different routers. The table of *Brekelbaum* is not. Nor does the table of *Brekelbaum* suggest the desirability to have such flexibility and instead suggests that standardization is desired.

Claim 6 also specifies that there are at least three groups of hole patterns, support for which is provided in Tables 1 to 3. *Brekelbaum* simply does not teach or suggest three sets of

mounting holes. Applicants therefore submit respectfully that Claim 6 and Claim 7 that depends therefrom are novel, nonobvious and patentably distinguished over *Brekelbaum*.

Regarding the anticipation rejection of Claim 11, Claim 11 as amended is directed to a router table having a vertical support and a table top. A plurality of sets of mounting hole patterns for mounting routers having differently sized footprints are provided. Further, the hole pattern groups are positioned operably in relation to a router hole provided by the table.

As stated above, *Brekelbaum* does not teach or suggest providing multiple sets of mounting holes for routers and indeed teaches away from same. Further, because *Brekelbaum* does not operate with a router, *Brekelbaum* cannot teach a router hole or the combination of a router hole spatially related to a plurality of sets of different router mounting holes. Claim 11 includes structural elements not taught by *Brekelbaum*. Claim 11 and Claims 12 and 13 should therefore be allowed.

The obviousness rejection of Claims 12 and 13 is rendered moot in view of the foregoing. Also, Claim 12 provides the additional patentable feature that the router hole is located centrally with respect to at least one set of router mounting holes. *Brekelbaum* cannot teach this structural and spatial limitation because *Brekelbaum* does not teach the router hole or the mounting holes.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 6, 7 and 11 through 13 are distinguished patentably over the art of record. Applicants submit that the amendments herein generally clarify the claims over *Brekelbaum* with respect to the claims as they stood previously. That is, the amendments, while distinguishing the claims over *Brekelbaum*, do not appear to raise new issues requiring new searching. Accordingly, Applicants believe that the proposed amendments should be entered. If the Examiner wishes to further clarify the claims over *Brekelbaum*, perhaps such clarification could be made via a phone call to Applicants' attorney and an Examiner's amendment.

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance and in the absence of more pertinent art such action is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the above amendment, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "Versions with Markings to Show Changes Made."

Respectfully submitted,  
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Robert W. Connors  
Reg. No. 46,639  
P.O. Box 1135  
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135  
Phone: (312) 807-4214

**VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE**

**In the Claims:**

Claim 6 has been amended as follows:

6. (Twice Amended) A router table ~~having a table top, comprising hole pattern groups having Group B holes, Group C holes, Group D holes, Group E holes, and Group F holes~~ within said table top a support connected to a table top that includes at least three groups of hole patterns, each group having different hole center distances for mounting routers having different footprints.

Claim 7 has been amended as follows:

7. (Amended) The router table as claimed in claim 6, further comprising ~~hole pattern groups having Group A holes, a threaded pilot pin hole, and a pilot pin storage hole~~ a router hole positioned operably in the table with respect to the hole pattern groups.

Claim 11 has been amended as follows:

11. (Amended) A router table ~~having a~~ comprising a support connected to a table top ~~, comprising at least five that includes a plurality of hole pattern groups within said table top, said groups each comprising at least two holes, each group having different hole center distances for mounting routers having different mounting footprints, the hole pattern groups positioned operably in relation to a router hole provided by the table.~~

Claim 12 has been amended as follows:

12. (Amended) The router table according to claim 11, wherein the ~~at least five hole pattern groups comprise twelve or more holes~~ router hole is positioned substantially centrally with respect to the hole pattern of at least one of the groups.

Claim 13 has been amended as follows:

13. (Amended) The router table according to claim 11, ~~wherein the at least two holes are configured to accept mounting elements of a router when mounting the router to the router table, the mounting elements protruding through the at least two holes~~ wherein the router hole is defined by the table top.